

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 181, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 580]

YEAS—231

Abraham	Granger	Mulvaney
Allen	Graves (GA)	Murphy (PA)
Amash	Graves (LA)	Neugebauer
Amodei	Graves (MO)	Newhouse
Babin	Griffith	Noem
Barletta	Grothman	Nunes
Barr	Guinta	Olson
Barton	Guthrie	Palazzo
Benishek	Hanna	Palmer
Billrakis	Hardy	Paulsen
Bishop (MI)	Harper	Pearce
Bishop (UT)	Harris	Perry
Black	Hartzler	Pittenger
Blackburn	Heck (NV)	Pitts
Blum	Hensarling	Poliquin
Bost	Herrera Beutler	Posey
Boustany	Hice, Jody B.	Ratcliffe
Brady (TX)	Hill	Reed
Brat	Holding	Reichert
Bridenstine	Hudson	Renacci
Brooks (AL)	Huelskamp	Ribble
Brooks (IN)	Huizenga (MI)	Rice (SC)
Buchanan	Hultgren	Rigell
Buck	Hunter	Roby
Bucshon	Hurd (TX)	Roe (TN)
Burgess	Hurt (VA)	Rogers (AL)
Byrne	Issa	Rogers (KY)
Calvert	Jenkins (KS)	Rohrabacher
Carter (GA)	Jenkins (WV)	Rokita
Carter (TX)	Johnson (OH)	Ros-Lehtinen
Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Roskam
Chaffetz	Jolly	Ross
Clawson (FL)	Jones	Rothfus
Coffman	Jordan	Rouzer
Cole	Joyce	Royce
Collins (GA)	Katko	Russell
Collins (NY)	Kelly (MS)	Salmon
Comer	Kelly (PA)	Sanford
Comstock	King (IA)	Scalise
Conaway	King (NY)	Schweikert
Cook	Kinzinger (IL)	Scott, Austin
Costello (PA)	Knight	Sensenbrenner
Cramer	Labrador	Sessions
Crawford	LaHood	Shimkus
Crenshaw	LaMalfa	Shuster
Culberson	Lamborn	Simpson
Curbelo (FL)	Lance	Smith (MO)
Davidson	LatTA	Smith (NE)
Davis, Rodney	LoBiondo	Smith (NJ)
Denham	Long	Stefanik
Dent	Loudermilk	Stewart
DesJarlais	Love	Stivers
Diaz-Balart	Lucas	Stutzman
Dold	Luetkemeyer	Thompson (PA)
Donovan	Lummis	Thornberry
Duffy	MacArthur	Tiberi
Duncan (SC)	Marchant	Tipton
Duncan (TN)	Marino	Trott
Ellmers (NC)	Massie	Turner
Emmer (MN)	McCarthy	Upton
Farenthold	McCaul	Valadao
Fincher	McClintock	Walberg
Fleischmann	McHenry	Walden
Flores	McKinley	Walker
Fortenberry	McMorris	Walorski
Fox	Rodgers	Walters, Mimi
Franks (AZ)	McSally	Weber (TX)
Frelinghuysen	Meadows	Webster (FL)
Garrett	Meehan	Wenstrup
Gibbs	Messer	Westerman
Gibson	Mica	Williams
Gohmert	Miller (MI)	Wilson (SC)
Goodlatte	Moolenaar	Wittman
Gosar	Mooney (WV)	Womack
Gowdy	Mullin	Woodall

Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)

Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin

Zinke

NAYS—181

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.

Brady (PA)
Brownley (CA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney

Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy

Cioccione
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay

Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers

Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley

Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny

DeFazio
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene

DeSaulnier
Deutsch
Dingell
Doggett

Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards

Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty

Evans
Farr
Foster
Frankel (FL)

Fudge
Aderholt
Blumenauer
Brown (FL)

DeGette
DeSantis
Fitzpatrick
Fleming

Forbes
Hinojosa
Kirkpatrick
Kline

Lewis
Miller (FL)
Nugent
Poe (TX)

Pompeo
Price, Tom
Rooney (FL)
Sanchez, Loretta

Smith (TX)
Wagner
Westmoreland

Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson

Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez

Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck (WA)

Higgins
Himes
Honda
Hoyer

Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries

Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating

Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer

Kind
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)

Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin

Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebbsack
Lofgren

Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
(NM)

Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney,

Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum

McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks

Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)

Nadler
Napolitano
Price, Tom
Rooney (FL)

Sanchez, Loretta
Smith (TX)
Wagner
Westmoreland

Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone

Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter

Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan

Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel

Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda
T.

Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader

Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)

Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter

Smith (WA)
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano

Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko

Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas

Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky

Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine

Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—22

□ 1742

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1745

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO POSTPONE PROCEEDINGS ON MOTION TO RECOMMIT ON H.R. 5711, PROHIBITING THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY FROM AUTHORIZING CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS RELATING TO COMMERCIAL PASSENGER AIRCRAFT TO IRAN

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the question of adopting a motion to recommit on H.R. 5711 be subject to postponement as though under clause 8 of rule XX.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PROHIBITING THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY FROM AUTHORIZING CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS RELATING TO COMMERCIAL PASSENGER AIRCRAFT TO IRAN

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 921, I call up the bill (H.R. 5711) to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from authorizing certain transactions by a U.S. financial institution in connection with the export or re-export of a commercial passenger aircraft to the Islamic Republic of Iran, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 921, in lieu of the amendment recommended by the Committee on Financial Services printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-66 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 5711

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

The Secretary of the Treasury may not authorize a transaction by a U.S. financial institution (as defined under section 561.309 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations) that is ordinarily incident to the export or re-export of a commercial passenger aircraft to the Islamic Republic of Iran.

If the Secretary of the Treasury authorized any transaction described under section 101 before the date of the enactment of this title, such authorization is hereby revoked.

This title may be cited as the "No Ex-Im Assistance for Terrorism Act".

SEC. 202. PROHIBITION ON EXPORT-IMPORT BANK FINANCING THAT WOULD BENEFIT IRAN.

Section 2(b) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(14) PROHIBITION ON FINANCING THAT WOULD BENEFIT IRAN.—

“(A) DIRECT FINANCING.—The Bank shall not guarantee, insure, or extend (or participate in an extension of) credit in connection with any transaction with respect to which credit assistance from the Bank is first sought after the effective date of this paragraph by—

“(i) the Government of Iran or an entity owned or controlled by the Government of Iran; or

“(ii) an entity created under Iranian law, or a foreign subsidiary of such an entity.

“(B) INDIRECT FINANCING.—The Bank shall not guarantee, insure, or extend (or participate in an extension of) credit in connection with any transaction with respect to which credit assistance from the Bank is first sought after the effective date of this paragraph involving—

“(i) an entity for the purpose of a transaction involving the Government of Iran or an entity referred to in subparagraph (A); or

“(ii) a non-United States entity that, in the 5-year period ending with the date of the enactment of this paragraph, has leased or sold aircraft to the Government of Iran or an entity referred to in subparagraph (A) in contravention of United States law, or a subsidiary or controlling parent of such a non-United States entity.

“(C) CANCELLATION OF APPROVED FINANCING.—The Bank shall cease the provision of financial assistance approved by the Bank in connection with a transaction with respect to which credit assistance from the Bank is approved after the effective date of this paragraph, on finding that the assistance has facilitated the export, sale, or lease of an aircraft to an entity referred to in subparagraph (A), and shall seek immediate recovery of any amount provided by the Bank in connection with the transaction.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services.

After 1 hour of debate, it shall be in order to consider the further amendment printed in part A of House Report 114-818, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be considered read and shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to submit extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

When our fellow Americans deposit their earnings in a U.S. bank or entrust

the government with their tax dollars, they do so assuming that their money will not be used in ways which undermine the security of our very Nation and, frankly, of the world. The legislation we are debating tonight is a package of bills that is designed to prevent the Obama administration from further undermining the trust of the American people and the security of our Nation, as well as the security of our allies.

Under President Obama's nuclear deal with Iran, formally known as the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, or the JCPOA, the administration agreed to authorize the export of civilian aircraft to Iran. What the JCPOA did not include was authorization for the U.S. financing of those sales. As Treasury Secretary Jack Lew said in April in a Council on Foreign Relations speech: “Iran, complied with the nuclear agreement. Therefore, the nuclear sanctions are lifted. I think that that is a process that is becoming more and more clear. And we'll keep our part of the bargain there. But the U.S. financial system is not open to Iran and that is not something that is going to change.”

Again, that was Secretary Jack Lew in April of this past year.

Mr. Speaker, something changed. In September, the Treasury's Office of Foreign Assets Control issued licenses to Airbus and to Boeing that permitted the sale of up to 97 airplanes to Iran Air, the country's flagship, state-owned carrier. These licenses didn't stop there, however. By going beyond the scope of the JCPOA, they also authorized U.S. financial institutions to “engage in all transactions necessary to provide financing or other financial services” related to the Iran Air orders.

My bill, H.R. 5711, would prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from authorizing U.S. financing through American banks in connection with the export of commercial aircraft to Iran just as the administration claimed was U.S. policy to begin with.

This bill would keep Americans' deposits away from a country that the President's own State Department calls “the world's foremost state sponsor of terrorism” and which the Treasury has designated as “a jurisdiction of primary money laundering concern.” Let me repeat that. The State Department, itself, says this is the world's foremost state sponsor of terrorism, and the Treasury Department has designated a jurisdiction of primary money laundering concern.

How many more red flags need to go up?

Under this bill, Americans would not have to fear that their savings are being channeled to Iran Air, which was sanctioned by the Treasury in 2011 for ferrying soldiers and weapons of war to Syria—the site of a 5-year conflict that has claimed a half a million lives and has displaced millions more.

This is the same Iran Air that a U.N. report concluded had shared ballistic military technology with North Korea

and is the same Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps whose deputy commander called for an end to Israel, making note of more than 100,000 missiles that were ready “for the annihilation—the wiping out—and the collapse of the Zionist regime.” Additionally, research by the Foundation for Defense of Democracies shows that Iran Air's support of the Assad regime continues to this very day.

Why should U.S. banks and their customers be implicated in Iranian atrocities?

I would submit that there is no reasonable answer to this, which is why this commonsense prohibition, when offered as an amendment to this year's Financial Services appropriations bill, was passed by this very body—the House of Representatives—by a voice vote.

However, this bill goes even further, Mr. Speaker. Not only will H.R. 5711 protect Americans' bank accounts, it will prevent their tax dollars from being used through the Export-Import Bank to subsidize aircraft sales to Iran. It would be through direct transactions or third-party leasing, which is becoming more and more common.

This codifies and strengthens an existing Ex-Im prohibition that is renewed in annual appropriations bills. For that reason, this measure enjoyed the support of Ex-Im supporters and critics alike when it came before the Financial Services Committee.

H.R. 5711 combines the text of two bills that were reported by the Committee on Financial Services; one of them sponsored by me and the other by Congressman ROSKAM of Illinois. Both pieces of legislation were cosponsored by our Democrat colleague, Congressman SHERMAN of California, who has devoted years to Iran policy, both as a member of the Financial Services Committee and of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

I thank Representative SHERMAN and Representative ROSKAM for working with me on this very important legislation package; and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this important bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am disappointed that we are here, yet again, debating another Republican bill to undermine the Iran nuclear deal—a deal that, so far, has delivered on its principal goal of blocking Iran's path to nuclear weapons for the foreseeable future. This is a dangerous move that, if enacted, would put U.S. and global security at risk.

Specifically, H.R. 5711 would prohibit the Treasury Secretary from authorizing any transaction by a U.S. financial institution to support the export of commercial planes to Iran. Doing so would violate a key component of the agreement in which the U.S. has committed to allowing the sales of these planes and the associated financial

services that are necessary to support the sales.

Earlier this year, the Treasury Department issued a license to Boeing for the sale of 80 passenger planes to Iran—valued at \$17.6 billion—and authorized U.S. financial institutions to engage in all transactions necessary to allow Boeing to receive payment for the sale. This legislation not only puts the Boeing deal in the crosshairs by prohibiting it from conducting a lawful sale under the agreement, but it also places the viability of the nuclear deal itself in question. Moreover, this legislation would breach the good faith provision in the agreement by which all parties agreed not to undermine its successful implementation.

H.R. 5711 also includes language that prevents the Export-Import Bank from financing exports to Iran, which is a red herring because the Ex-Im Bank has not supported exports to Iran since the 1970s, and it is legally prohibited from doing so as long as Iran is a state sponsor of terror.

Notably, the bill removes the President's national security waiver with regard to these restrictions—a move that denies the President the flexibility that is necessary to work with our allies to find the most effective ways of changing Iran's behavior. The fact is that all previous Iran sanctions bills that have passed the House and that have become law have included a Presidential waiver that gives the President the flexibility to act quickly and maneuver when doing so serves the U.S. national security interest.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly concerned that this bill comes at a time of deep global uncertainty about U.S. foreign policy. We have a President-elect whose talk on foreign policy has ranged from vague and contradictory in some areas to utterly incoherent elsewhere. He has inserted unpredictability into the international arena, has questioned the value of U.S. alliances, and has threatened the cornerstones of decades of American foreign policy leadership.

Yet, instead of reassuring the world that the United States is committed to working with our global allies to promote our collective security, House Republicans have decided to push yet another piece of legislation through the House to destabilize the agreement that is central to preventing Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons.

□ 1800

I do wonder why their leadership decided to bring this bill to the floor now in the lameduck session when they know the President will veto it. Perhaps my colleagues on the other side of the aisle know that in two short months, they will no longer have the luxury of legislating without consequences.

Come January, we will have a President who has called the Iran nuclear agreement the worst deal ever negotiated. Like most of his other nonsense

policies, Mr. Trump has claimed he will either more strictly enforce the agreement or negotiate “a much better deal” or dismantle it altogether. We don't know, and he doesn't know.

So I am going to bet that, under the Trump administration, Republicans will not be so eager to move legislation to unravel this agreement because, like the rest of us, they do not know how Mr. Trump will govern and because they know there is no other reasonable approach to curbing Iran's nuclear ambition, short of military intervention.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this bill and sending a strong message to the President-elect and our allies around the world that Democrats remain committed to a strong U.S. engagement in the world and will not tolerate any attempt to undermine the Iran nuclear deal or any other international arrangements that keep us safe.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM), a leader on this issue who is the author of H.R. 5715.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) and also Chairman HENSARLING for their consistent and persistent work on this issue.

My friend from California mentioned a minute ago her disappointment. Well, if you want to talk about disappointment and destabilizing of the deal, just look at what the Iranians have done since the JCPOA passed. By the way, a majority of the House of Representatives and a majority of the United States Senate, not on a partisan basis either, Mr. Speaker, voted against the JCPOA. So let's put that in context. But the President insisted, he moved along, and here we are. So let's see what we can do about it.

Before we fix it, let's look at what the Iranians have done. They are the destabilizers. There have been Iranian-supplied rockets launched at a U.S. Naval ship. Iran has fired rockets within 1,500 feet in December of last year on U.S. ships numerous times. The IRGC patrol boats have aggressively harassed U.S. ships in the Strait of Hormuz. Iran has launched numerous ballistic missile tests in violation of the U.N. Security Council resolutions. They violated the JCPOA by producing excess heavy water. They continue to kidnap Americans and hold them for ransom.

So let's put it where it lies. The destabilizing impact doesn't belong with the United States. It doesn't belong with any statement by an American policyholder. The destabilizing nature belongs, Mr. Speaker, to the Iranian regime, the mullahs themselves.

So the gentlewoman from California said she is disappointed. Well, look, I mean, disappointment, get used to it. It is the nature of things. The nature of the disappointment is that we now have American companies that are saying: You know what? Let's go in and

let's do business with a terrorist regime.

How is that?

Let's just go make a buck. That is the scandal of this. The scandal is that there are American companies, there are international companies—Boeing, Airbus—that are now making their own names inextricably linked with terror forever more. That is the scandal.

So what are we trying to do?

The gentlewoman said that the Ex-Im elements of this—I think she said—was a red herring. If not, it was words to that effect.

No, it is not so. Because if you look carefully at what the Ex-Im prohibition actually prohibits, Mr. Speaker, it prohibits the direct financing to the Iranian regime. Fine, if that is all this did, well and good. There is no reason to oppose it, then.

Of course, that is not where the Ex-Im is actually limited. Because here is what can happen: under current law, the Ex-Im Bank can do a deal with the Europeans, for example.

What can happen, then?

That can be leased under current law to the Iranians. This amendment, Mr. HUIZENGA's language, would prohibit that. That is what we are trying to do.

Look, think about the irony of this. You have got an administration that currently is telling Americans it is a dangerous thing to go to Iran; that you are at risk of being kidnapped if you go to Iran. At the same time—picture this, Mr. Speaker—that that is being articulated, they are also saying: We are going to help you do some business over there.

That is ridiculous. It is absurd, it is contradictory, and it is indefensible.

So here is the good news: The good news is we can do something about it. The other good news is this Iran deal has a very short shelf life because the President-elect has said he doesn't like it.

President Obama didn't do the hard work of developing a national consensus on it. If he had, it would have been a treaty and a treaty that would have bound the United States in permanency; but he didn't do that. Why? Because it was a bad idea and he couldn't sell it to Congress. So he went the easy way, did it basically by executive order. And what goes around comes around.

So we can do some good work here today. We can move this out. Is President Obama going to sign it?

Obviously not, but that is not to say that it is not what we should do. We know what we need to do. We need to make sure that the American financial system is not complicit in this deal. We need to make sure that American taxpayers are not subsidizing this deal.

I urge the bill's passage.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES), a member of the Financial Services Committee and the House

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the gentleman from Michigan, once again, we find ourselves in this dreary and dangerous ritual of considering a bill which, without question, would cause us to violate our agreement under the JCPOA. We get the same arguments about how bad the Iranian regime is, and we get the same misstatements like: This is President Obama's deal.

It is not President Obama's deal. It is a deal of the United Nations Security Council, of China, of Russia, of Great Britain, of France, of Germany, the U.K., and the rest of the world who combined working for a period of almost 15 years hammered out a deal—and I say this as a member of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence—which today has removed Iran as a nuclear threat.

Yet, here again, we are offered a bill that would compromise our obligations and almost certainly result in centrifuges spinning once again in Tehran and then leading on to the very likely prospect of yet another Middle Eastern war.

Yes, Iran is a sponsor of terrorism. Yes, it is a bad place. You will get no argument from this side of the aisle that this is a bad regime.

Once again, I remind my Republican friends that their patron saint, Ronald Reagan, made a nuclear deal with the Soviet Union, also a sponsor of terrorism, an appalling regime; but Ronald Reagan was smart enough to know that you can make a deal that makes everybody safer even with some very bad people. Ronald Reagan.

One thing I know as a member of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence is that what used to be a mortal national security threat to the United States—2 to 3 months from breakout time, 2 to 3 months over which would almost certainly be involved in yet another war in the Middle East—has been taken off the table.

Now, the Republicans not only seek to scuttle that deal with all of the implications, but they do it by stopping an American company from selling a flagship American product around the world. If you use the Department of Commerce's multiplier, the bill they are pushing today would result in 100,000 American jobs not created so that they can continue with this fetish of eliminating a deal, which has made us safer.

If there is any question about whether this has made us safer, let me again quote General Gadi Eizenkot, who is the chief of staff of the Israeli Defense Forces. He said the deal has actually removed the most serious danger to Israel's existence for the foreseeable future and greatly reduced the threat over the longer term. That is the chief of staff of the Israeli Defense Forces, but my friends in the Republican Party know better about what is good for Israel.

These sad charades end pretty soon because the bluff has been called. President Trump has said he will tear up the Iran deal. When he does that—because this, of course, is not becoming law—the centrifuges will spin again. To my friends on the other side of the aisle, when the centrifuges are spinning, we and I will stand here and we will tell the American people why centrifuges are spinning again. And where we were 2 years ago when we thought we were going to war with Iran, if we go to Iran, when Israeli planes are bombing Iran, we will stand here and explain why we are now in another Middle Eastern war. We can avoid that by ending these charades and finally accepting this deal.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), who is the chairman of the Small Business Committee, but also a previous chair of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5711. I want to commend my colleagues, Congressmen HUIZENGA and SHERMAN, for authoring this bipartisan piece of legislation.

It was once said that the West would sell its enemies the rope that would be used to hang itself with. Well, because of the disastrously flawed Iran deal, that is exactly what we are currently doing. That is why this legislation is so important.

H.R. 5711 essentially prevents the export or reexport of commercial passenger aircraft to the Islamic Republic of Iran. This bill would cut off Iran's means of delivering weapons to terrorist organizations like Hamas and Hezbollah, and to Syrian dictator Bashir al-Assad, a war criminal who is responsible for the worst refugee crisis since the Second World War.

The truth is we wouldn't even need to be here today if the Obama administration had just paid attention to the facts on the ground in the Middle East. When negotiating the disastrous Iran nuclear deal, despite knowing Iran was the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism, President Obama and Secretary Kerry permitted the sale of commercial aircraft to Iran anyway.

Incredibly, under current U.S. law, if we issued a license for Iran Air to purchase aircraft from an American manufacturer and then Iran walked away from its commitment, U.S. taxpayers would have to foot the bill for Iran. In this case, that could be up to \$70 billion on the U.S. taxpayer. Given Iran Air's multiple unpaid commitments over the years, that outrageous outcome is entirely possible.

So for all of the reasons that I have mentioned and for reasons that have been stated already by my colleagues, I would urge clear-minded people on both sides of the aisle to support this legislation.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the

gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), a senior member of the House Appropriations Committee.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 5711.

This legislation is only the latest misguided and politicized effort by the majority to undermine the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, a historic agreement negotiated by the world's major powers in order to keep Iran from developing a nuclear weapon.

Simply put, enactment of H.R. 5711 would violate the United States Government's obligations under the JCPOA, opening the door for Iran to walk away from this agreement. It also threatens to undermine our credibility with our allies and negotiating partners.

Now, we must be vigilant. No one disagrees that we must be vigilant in ensuring Iranian compliance with the terms of the JCPOA. We also should continue to hold Iran to account for its violations of human rights, for its sponsorship of terrorism, and for its nonnuclear weapons development.

Last night, I supported, as did almost every Member of this body, a clean reauthorization of the Iran Sanctions Extension Act, which guarantees Congress' ability to snap back sanctions should Iran violate the JCPOA. The reauthorization also allows Congress to take positive action on transition day should it be verified that Iran has used its nuclear capacity only for peaceful purposes.

So the continued authorization of sanctions will allow the United States to continue to exert pressure on the Iranian regime. The dangerous bill before us today will do just exactly the opposite. By directly blocking a specific provision of the JCPOA—namely, the permissible sale of commercial passenger aircraft—this legislation would send a clear message to the Iranian people that the United States does not negotiate in good faith; that we expect to have it both ways, with Iran dismantling its nuclear facilities and getting nothing in return.

□ 1815

We must also remember, my colleagues, that the Iran nuclear agreement is not just a bilateral agreement between Iran and the United States. It is the product of years and years of negotiations between Iran and the P5+1, which is the United Kingdom, China, France, Russia, Germany, and the United States. The bill before us today would break faith with those negotiating partners in a reckless and dangerous way.

Because of this agreement, the breakout time for Iran to develop enough weapons-grade material for a nuclear weapon went from 2 to 3 months to a year or more. Because of this agreement, the international community has 24/7 access to Iran's nuclear sites. Because of this agreement, we possess the enforcement mechanisms necessary to verify Iran's compliance.

By all objective accounts, Iran has upheld its end of the bargain. Why would we give up these capabilities by failing to uphold ours? In light of the political transitions taking place in our country, now is especially the time when the United States must keep its word, its word to our allies and to the international community.

Now, regardless of all this, it appears that our Republican colleagues are willing to jeopardize a major international agreement for political advantage. They are willing to undermine the credibility of the United States and our allies on the international stage.

My colleagues, instead of scoring political points or seeking to undo the foreign policy legacy of the outgoing President, we should be working together in a bipartisan manner to ensure this agreement's success. For that reason, I urge colleagues to vote against this bill.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS), a member of the House Committee on Financial Services.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5711.

Despite the President's assurances, Iran remains a menace to the stability of the Middle East and a threat to America and its allies. All of us, both Republicans and Democrats, need to take action to reduce the harm that this rogue state and its accomplices can do.

H.R. 5711 takes some very important steps in that effort. By prohibiting the Secretary of the Treasury from green-lighting U.S. financing for the export of commercial aircraft to Iran, we are making it more difficult for Iranian airlines to acquire planes that we know are used to ferry soldiers and weapons.

I need to ask my colleagues across the aisle: Is that such a bad idea?

By blocking Ex-Im assistance to the Government of Iran, we are preventing the U.S. taxpayer from subsidizing efforts by the world's foremost state sponsor of terrorism to acquire aircraft to support its deadly activities around the world. We can all agree that Ex-Im should never be used for this purpose.

The Government of Iran continues to fund terrorist activities, and it is intimately involved in Syria's violent civil war. Let us not forget the recent hostile actions taken by Houthi rebels in Yemen. These rebels receive funds from Iran, and they fired missiles at U.S. Navy warships on patrol in the Red Sea.

The American people cannot be complicit in these hostilities. We owe it to our constituents and our allies around the world to pass this commonsense legislation.

I thank my colleagues from Michigan, Illinois, and California for introducing this bill. I urge its support.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, will this Congress ground Boeing or support this key manufacturer and the jobs that it creates, that have already helped make America great? Will we march to the tune of the pied pipers against peace who see war with Iran as the only way to restrain it from developing nuclear weapons? Part of what makes trade so important to us is that countries that trade together are less likely to go to war with one another.

The House today is being asked to vote to block the sale of about 80 Boeing aircraft to update an aging and unsafe commercial airline in Iran. If this bill passes, that is bad news for a major American business, and it is also bad news to thousands of skilled workers across this country who won't see any part of what could be a \$25 billion deal. It is great news for Boeing's major European competitor to get the work that these supporters would deny to Boeing.

This is, of course, just the latest of one effort after another to undermine the only way forward, short of war, to limit Iran's ability to develop nuclear weapons. This realization is why this very week so many national security experts have urged Mr. Trump to reconsider, to reverse his threat to break the promises that our country made in an international agreement. This week also, the European Union affirmed its support for that international agreement. The six other countries that joined us in that international agreement are honoring their promises, and we should do the same thing.

What will keep Boeing from flying high? It is the war hawks that fly high, so insistent on undermining this important pact that has made our family safer. If the hawks win, it is about more than losing a multibillion-dollar deal to one American manufacturer. It really means that nothing—nothing—but the threat of another American war, an American attack, will hold Iran back from developing nuclear weapons.

This is about more than destabilizing the American workforce. Undermining this agreement will destabilize the Middle East. It will jeopardize our families and the families of our allies. Once again, this measure should be rejected.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER), a member of the Committee on Financial Services.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to voice my support for H.R. 5711 and to thank Congressman HUIZENGA for his leadership on this very important issue.

This bill prohibits the Secretary of the Treasury from authorizing certain transactions by U.S. financial institutions in connection with the export or reexport of a commercial passenger aircraft to the Islamic Republic of Iran.

As the primary sponsor of terrorism throughout the world, it is imperative

that we hold Iran accountable and do all we can to limit their abilities to promote this type of action and behavior. This bill confronts the same airline that has been sanctioned by the Treasury Department for transporting fighters and weapons on behalf of Iran's Revolutionary Guard.

It is beyond me how the administration can be okay with allowing Iran access to airplanes which would only further their support of terrorism. I supported this commonsense legislation when it was marked up in the Committee on Financial Services, and I am proud to support it today.

Thank you to my good friend, Congressman HUIZENGA, for sponsoring this legislation.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations on the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California, Ranking Member WATERS, for the leadership that she gave this issue in the Committee on Financial Services, and I rise today to offer my opposition to this bill for a number of reasons.

I will say that it is interesting—I heard my colleague from North Carolina mention the Soviet Union and the interests and the efforts that President Reagan made to, in fact, make America safer in his time and in his context. Interestingly, in the backdrop of today, one could now argue that Russia has, in its portfolio, advocacy for terrorists as well as a large profile of cyberterrorism and hacking into the United States as well as a blatant interference in the most recent Presidential election. As I look to my colleagues speaking about what the President-elect will do, I would hope that he would not undermine the national security of this Nation.

First of all, we know that this bill will be vetoed if it gets to the desk of President Obama. This bill would damage a hard-fought diplomatic solution that makes the world safer from nuclear war. The sanctions are working, including extensive monitoring of the nuclear capability of Iran.

We also, in a bipartisan manner, supported the potential extinction of Iran sanctions yesterday, and that was the right thing to do, the opportunity or the possibility of doing that. But this bill, in particular, flies in the face of a realistic approach to how we do international engagement.

The JCPOA has significantly constrained Iran's nuclear program. Key aspects of the program are dismantled under the JCPOA, and it subjects Iran's nuclear program to unprecedented verification and monitoring requirements. It is working.

It is profoundly in the national security interests of the United States to continue to meet our commitments

under the JCPOA as long as Iran continues to meet its commitments. Our allies are depending on us. The word of the United States should mean something. We even know that Israel has seen a positive impact, some of its military persons have indicated, by way of the JCPOA.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. This bill prohibits the involvement of U.S. financial institutions in the sale of commercial passenger aircraft to Iran Air, civil end use that would put U.S. aircraft manufacturers at a competitive disadvantage with their foreign competitors whose access to financing would not be subject to the same constraints. This is not putting commercialism or jobs above national security. It is, in fact, allowing civil end use to continue as we are standing for our national security.

The sweeping and vague nature of this provision would have a chilling effect on U.S. and non-U.S. entities seeking to engage in permissible business with Iran. The United States has a long tradition of remaining faithful to our commitments with our international partners, and a reversal of this principle undercuts our credibility, diminishes our ability to lead globally, and threatens the very alliances we rely upon in implementing the JCPOA. We can anticipate that should this bill become law, our closest allies would view this bill as a violation of the JCPOA commitments, and Iran would take the issue to the Joint Commission.

The main thing of this bill is that it will douse the friendship and alliance that we are making with allies who want a peaceful nonproliferation of nuclear activity. This is a "no" vote in order to provide for the national security of this Nation.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT), a member of the House Committee on Financial Services.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman HUIZENGA for the couple minutes. This is one of those moments, has anyone actually read the four pages on the bill? Great. In that case, we should all know this isn't about selling jets. It is about using the American financial system to finance them. That is what the language of the bill is.

Think about this. We have now spent the last 6 years around this body talking over and over and over how we are going to keep the American financial system safe, how we are going to not do things that concentrate debt within our capital markets.

If Iran wants to buy jets, let them go find bilateral agreements in other countries. Let them show up with the cash. Let them go find someone else to put up the surety bonds. Let someone

else go put up the coverage on the lost pieces on the ladder of the financing.

This piece of legislation coming through the Committee on Financial Services is about protecting our financial system, first, from what many of us on the committee believe is going to turn into bad debt and functionally become toxic within our financial markets; but then, secondly, do you really want the United States financial system providing liquidity and financing for the leading state sponsor of terrorism in the world? That is a pretty powerful ethical question when you consider what we have been through in cleaning up our own financial system over the last few years.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I am sorry that Mr. PITTINGER left because I really did want to share this point with him.

It is important to note that nothing in this legislation will keep new passenger aircraft out of the hands of Iran. The bill only prevents Boeing from selling civilian passenger aircraft to Iran, while foreign aircraft manufacturers, such as Airbus, will still be able to sell their passenger planes to Iran since they won't need U.S. financial institutions to help finance their deals.

□ 1830

What is this? Is this some kind of payback to Boeing? Is this some kind of—

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. That is actually not true. Airbus is subject to this as well because of the significant number of parts and material in the jets that they produce. So they would be subject to this as well as Boeing.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Reclaiming my time, there is nothing in this legislation that will keep new passenger aircraft out of the hands of Iran.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS), who is also a member of the House Financial Services Committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman HUIZENGA for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, the Obama administration's State Department recognizes the Islamic Republic of Iran as one of three state sponsors of terrorism. But, ironically, the President calls his deal with Iran a foreign policy achievement. Our Commander in Chief is proud of his plan that puts Iran on the path to getting a nuclear weapon. He is proud of his plan that condones and facilitates U.S. business with Iran.

In September, the Treasury Department authorized the sale of up to 97 Airbus and Boeing planes to Iran. Iran

is more than just a labeled state sponsor of terrorism. Iran uses its financial sector for international money laundering.

Iran has been a long-time supporter of the brutal Assad regime in Syria. It has supported a government that has killed hundreds of thousands of its own people. Iran's leader has pledged to wipe America and Israel off the map, but none of these facts matter to the Obama administration. They will do whatever they can just to make a deal and ensure a legacy.

Mr. Speaker, why are we rewarding and aiding a nation that has contributed to so much disorder and destruction in the Middle East?

To me, it is simply a no-brainer. We must not authorize U.S. aircraft sales to Iran.

I urge my colleagues to pass H.R. 5711, which would prohibit the Treasury Secretary from authorizing U.S. financing in connection with commercial passenger aircraft to Iran.

In God we trust.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share a portion of a letter from J Street: J Street Calls on Members of Congress to Oppose Anti-JCPOA Bill Restricting Commercial Aircraft Sales.

The last paragraph says:

"Additionally, the bill would not even achieve its intended objective of preventing Iran from acquiring commercial aircraft—it would merely ensure that Iran purchases them from a foreign producer, pointlessly denying jobs and income to working Americans and communities across the country. Like so many of the legislative attempts by JCPOA opponents to undermine or kill the agreement, this bill is just another cynical messaging exercise that hurts rather than helps America's essential interests, security, and standing in the world.

"J Street therefore urges Members of Congress to oppose H.R. 5711 and reaffirm the United States' commitment to uphold its international obligations."

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN), a distinguished member of the House Financial Services Committee.

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman HUIZENGA and also Chairman HENSARLING for bringing this very important issue before the American people.

Mr. Speaker, it is a horrible idea to allow the United States Government to help the Iranian Government support terrorism. This bill helps make sure that does not happen.

Now, the world knows that the Iranian Government has a very long history of using their state-owned Iran Air to transport weapons and military personnel for the Revolutionary Guard, which, in turn, trains, arms, and funds

terrorist organizations around the world. The Revolutionary Guard and the Government of Iran has American blood on its hands.

It should be very concerning to everybody in this Chamber, Republicans and Democrat, that the Iranian leaders for years have chanted, Death to America, and have vowed to wipe the State of Israel off the map. The Iranian Government cannot be trusted.

Now, the United States financial institutions should not be allowed to help the Iranian Government purchase aircraft and other equipment proven to be used for military purposes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 5711, is a good, commonsense bill. I implore everybody in this Chamber, Republicans and Democrats, to do what is right and to stand up and vote "yes" for H.R. 5711 to make sure we do not assist the chief sponsor of terrorism in this world to conduct its activities.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I like Mr. POLIQUIN. He is a nice man. He always has a nice smile. But I don't trust him more than I trust J Street.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire as to the balance of the time remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KNIGHT). The gentleman from Michigan has 10½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from California has 10¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL), who is a member of the Financial Services Committee and a former Treasury official.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Michigan for yielding.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 5711. And I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), who serves on our committee, for his leadership on this measure and consistently works on matters concerning Iran, as well as Mr. ROSKAM of Illinois.

I was proud to be a member this past Congress on the Financial Services Committee Task Force to Investigate Terrorism Financing. During our hearings, Mr. Speaker, we heard numerous witnesses describe Iran's support for terrorism and other evil activities.

It is really staggering, Mr. Speaker, that we sit here tonight and we have a Member of the other party suggest that Iran is a friend to the United States. There is no friendship between Iran and the United States or our allies. I think that is a stunning thing to say on the House floor.

You have heard tonight about Iran's direct involvement in conflicts in Iraq, Syria, Yemen; their support of Hamas, Hezbollah. And one of the main methods they use to support their terrorist activities around the world is they are flying commercial aircraft by the Quds Force around this world supporting

terrorism, supplying Assad in Syria, who is responsible for the deaths of hundreds.

This deal is not about blocking airplane sales, Mr. Speaker. This deal is about protecting taxpayers on financing airplane sales, protecting our banks in the financing of airplane sales. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the Obama administration has already provided the Government of Iran, the mullahs in Iran over \$100 billion in freed-up cash and has given them \$1.7 billion in Euros in cash on pallets. Let them use that to buy an aircraft. Let's assume they cost \$100 million, \$150 million. They can buy several aircraft and pay cash, thanks to the failed diplomacy of the Obama administration.

So, again, this legislation is about the belief that the United States should not directly support terrorism and the killing of innocent civilians.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I support this bill. It is the mission of Iran to use these aircraft for nefarious purposes. We already have that guilt on our hands by the release of \$100 billion and \$1.7 billion in cash. Let's not compound the errors of the past by opposing this bill, which will limit taxpayer risk and our financial sector risk at financing aircraft to Iran.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the balance of my time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD), a distinguished Member, friend, and former member of the House Financial Services Committee.

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend from Michigan for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I just find it fascinating that here we are again. Listen, we can talk about the JCPOA, this Iran nuclear deal, which I think is a historic mistake, which will haunt us for generations. There is no question about that. If anybody was unclear about where I stand or where I think many in this body stand, let me just simply say that I think this will be a historic mistake that will haunt us.

Ultimately, when we are talking about the world's greatest state sponsor of terrorism, what is amazing to me is the fact that this is not even up for debate in the administration. The administration will tell you: Yes, Iran is the world's greatest state sponsor of terror.

And you know what? With this agreement, if our destination was to say, You know what, we want to ensure

that Iran is never able to get a nuclear weapon, this deal all but ensures it. BOB MENENDEZ, a Democrat over in the Senate, said those very words. Prime Minister Netanyahu says this is a historic mistake.

So, yes, we can talk about some of the others over there who believe this is a good thing, but ultimately we realize this is a bad thing. This is a bad thing because, frankly, as we talk about quoting J Street on the floor, I personally want to say that I will trust BRUCE POLIQUIN from Maine, my colleague on the Financial Services Committee. When it comes to a financing bill, yes, I trust BRUCE POLIQUIN a heck of a lot more than I trust J Street. J Street, frankly, is in the tank for the other side. They are not an objective body, I believe.

Ultimately, as we look at this bill, Mr. Speaker, this bill doesn't prevent the sale of aircraft. As much as I would like to prevent the sale of aircraft to the world's greatest state sponsor of terror, which could use the aircraft to send supplies and soldiers—because we know that Iran is sending money and supplies to Hezbollah, Hamas, to Assad in Syria. Frankly, this administration will tell you the same thing.

This is a bill that prevents the financing. Ultimately, as we look at, how do we protect taxpayer dollars, how do we protect the deposits of millions of Americans that go to Main Street and deposit in their local banks?

We are just saying, you can't use financing to go finance the planes that are going over into Iran, the world's greatest state sponsor of terror.

If they want to pay cash, it would be one thing to say, You know what? I don't think you have got any cash.

Wait, we know they have got cash. Why? Because we just sent an unmarked plane with unmarked bills full of cash, ultimately, we know, for the release of hostages. We have got \$1.7 billion that we know is there. We have got \$100 billion worth of sanctions relief. You know what, I am counting on the fact that they have got the resources to spend.

So what this is doing is this is trying to protect the American taxpayer. Ultimately, what we do know, the administration agrees to authorize the export of civilian aircraft to Iran. That still can happen. This bill does not change that one iota.

What it does do is it says that you cannot use U.S. financing for those sales. Ultimately, I think that is a good thing because when we look and we want to go back and they want to talk about it, this is something about the JCPOA, the Iran deal.

What is interesting to me, Mr. Speaker, is that the only thing that was bipartisan in the Iran deal was its opposition in this body to that deal. Frankly, I think we ought to be doing everything in our power to make sure that we keep and hold Iran accountable, and we should not be financing planes that go in there because, ultimately, we know they have already

fired missiles. Right? They have already broken their agreements. They have fired missiles. They have fired weapons over at U.S. ships. They have captured U.S. sailors. They are taking hostages.

This is not a good actor. Frankly, we should be doing everything in our power to make sure that we are holding them accountable and ratcheting up sanctions. We should not make it easier for them to be able to purchase planes.

Frankly, we have got all manufacturers that are out there that have parts in the United States that would be implicated with this. So this is not singling out a single U.S. carrier.

We want to talk about pro-growth, but what we don't want to do is talk about pro-growth opportunities that are going to help the world's greatest state sponsor of terror. This is a mistake if we do not pass this piece of legislation.

I am confident that this bipartisan piece of legislation is going to be able to pass this House. My hope is that the Senate will take it up. I don't believe that the President will sign it—and I think that will be a mistake—but that should not prevent this body from doing the right thing.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am going to go right back to where we started at the beginning. The world's greatest state sponsor of terror should not be aided by the U.S. taxpayer, by our banking system, in order to finance planes that we really don't know what they are going to do with them. But what we do know is that Iran is a bad actor and they are going to continue to be the world's greatest state sponsor of terror.

So I am going to urge my colleagues to support this bill. It is a common-sense piece of bipartisan legislation. I want to thank the chairman for his work on it, and I want to thank Chairman HENSARLING as well. I want to thank Mr. ROSKAM, and I want to thank everybody here who is going to stand up united to say, this is going to something that we need to hold Iran accountable to.

□ 1845

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I am prepared to close.

I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I was surprised to hear the gentleman from Illinois just repeating some of the outrageous statements that Mr. Trump made during the campaign where he talked about the airplane carrying billions of dollars to Iran. I guess we are going to be hearing a lot of that around here.

Mr. Speaker, next year, President-elect Trump will face a daunting array of international challenges. The most pressing of these will be curbing Islamic terrorism, reining in Russian corruption and hegemony, and dealing with the civil wars in Iraq and Syria.

The self-proclaimed Islamic State, though it is in retreat in Iraq and Syria, has demonstrated its ability to operate beyond the confines of the Middle East and sponsor attacks in Asia, Europe, and the United States. Moreover, the nuclear threat posed by North Korea will require an immediate and coherent policy response from the Trump administration.

So if ever there was a time when the U.S. should be affirming our commitment to the international agreements that promote our stability and security in such a volatile global environment, the time is now. We should be working to reassure our allies and the rest of the world that the U.S. is committed to internationalism and to shaping and preserving the world economic and political order. Yet, Republicans are intent on playing politics and continuing their futile attempts to undermine the Iran nuclear agreement and put the global community at risk of a nuclear Iran.

Over the past few months, this House passed Republican bills to reinstate a program denying Iranian financial institutions access to U.S. dollars; to prohibit the U.S. from buying heavy water from Iran, a key component for some nuclear reactors; and most recently, to prohibit so-called ransom payments to Iran, which would, in fact, put the U.S. in violation of its international obligations under the Algiers Accords, which have been in effect since 1981, under both Republican and Democratic administrations.

The White House has issued a statement of policy making it clear that the President would veto the bill before us today, stating: "The United States has a long tradition of remaining faithful to our commitments and our international partners, and a reversal of this principle undercuts our credibility, diminishes our ability to lead globally, and threatens the very alliances we rely upon in implementing the JCPOA."

We know that this bill would violate a key provision of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action that specifically committed to the sale of commercial planes to Iran by prohibiting our financial institutions from facilitating those sales. It also would put U.S. aircraft manufacturers at a competitive disadvantage with their foreign competitors, whose access to financing would not be subject to the same constraints.

The legislation is also concerning because it would remove the President's national security waiver with regard to restrictions on the Export-Import Bank's ability to finance exports to Iran. While the administration has never exercised this authority, I believe removing the President's discretion and leverage on critical national security matters would be a serious mistake.

So I strongly oppose this bill that aims to undo the hard-fought progress to contain Iran's nuclear ambitions

and undercuts our ability to exercise global leadership, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, to quote the great American President, Ronald Reagan: "There you go again." Attack the President-elect, and try to throw out red herrings.

The bill that we have before us has two simple titles, the Iran Financing Prohibition—and I will read section 101: "The Secretary of the Treasury may not authorize a transaction by a U.S. financial institution."

Section 102, Revocation of Prior Authorizations: "If the Secretary of the Treasury authorized any transaction described under section 101 before the date of the enactment of this title, such authorization is hereby revoked."

We are halfway through. Section 2, Title II, No Ex-Im Assistance for Terrorism. It simply says that there is a prohibition—on section 202: "Prohibition on Export-Import Bank Financing that would Benefit Iran." That means direct financing. That would be subhead A.

Indirect Financing, meaning you can't have a third party get that lending from the Export-Import Bank, by the way, a U.S. taxpayer-funded bank. So that is subhead B.

And C is Cancellation of Approved Financing, if they have done that already.

This bill is not that complicated, and this bill does not cite any particular company. It does not limit any company from selling aircraft to Iran, no matter how big of a mistake that might be.

It simply says—as I might add, Secretary Jack Lew, Secretary of the Treasury, said in April of this year: There will be no U.S. financial institution financing this deal. And we have added that second section, that second title that says: There will be no use of the U.S. taxpayer-financed Export-Import Bank. That is all this bill says.

So you have heard attacks on the President-elect. You have heard attacks on the Export-Import Bank and whether this is going to be good or bad for U.S. employers and employees.

The simple fact is, Mr. Speaker, that this bill, H.R. 5711, says: We are not going to allow U.S. financial institutions, and U.S. financial institutions only, to be used to finance these deals; and we are not going to allow the Export-Import Bank of the United States to be used, either directly or indirectly, to finance that deal.

Iran can go put this deal together with other banks in Asia, Europe, anywhere else in the world that they can find it, but not here in the United States and not using taxpayer dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support

H.R. 5711, the No U.S. Financing for Iran Act, introduced by my good friend BILL HUIZENGA. This bill also includes the outstanding work of my good friend PETER ROSKAM, who introduced H.R. 5715, the No Ex-Im Assistance for Terrorism Act.

Mr. Speaker, President Obama has made an endless stream of concessions to the Iranian government. Most recently, in September, the administration announced that it would issue special export licenses for Boeing and Airbus to sell dozens of commercial aircraft to Iran—a deal that together is valued at upwards of \$50 billion. Yet the deal is not finalized because Iran is having difficulty financing it.

The No U.S. Financing for Iran Act will guarantee that the U.S. plays no part in facilitating this financing: it blocks the Treasury Department from authorizing U.S. financial institutions from supporting such transactions and prevents the U.S. Export-Import Bank from extending direct or indirect credit to the Government of Iran.

Although the Ex-Im Bank is prohibited from providing direct financing to Iran, it could do so through a third-party. For instance, Reuters last week reported that after months of negotiations, Iran secured financing possibly through an Emirati leasing company for the first 17 planes it plans to buy from Airbus. If the U.S. Ex-Im Bank were to provide financing to such a third-party company, it would in effect be facilitating Iran's purchase of the aircraft.

It is important to recall why Iran should not be receiving these planes in the first place: until President Obama implemented his nuclear deal, Iran Air had for over four years been subject to U.S. sanctions due to the company's notorious working relationship with Iran's military and Revolutionary Guards Corps. For years, Iran Air has smuggled rockets, missiles, and other sensitive materiel aboard its passenger and cargo planes bound for regional hotspots, such as Syria, home to Iranian terrorist proxies and murderous regimes.

The Obama Administration was absolutely wrong to drop these sanctions in connection with the nuclear deal because this support has little or nothing to do with Iran's nuclear program. On the contrary, much of this activity is related to Iran's sponsorship of terrorism—for which the United States still imposes sanctions on Iran.

It is long past time for the Administration to stop accommodating this genocidal regime and rather hold it to account. Just last week the IAEA reported that Iran had for the second time this year exceeded its quota for heavy water as stipulated in the nuclear deal. But instead of calling this violation what it is, the Obama Administration chose to sweep it under the rug. Such passivity in the face of Iranian violations only emboldens the regime to see what more it can get away with. This is a dangerous game to play when the consequences are so grave for our national security and that of our close ally Israel.

The Administration's nuclear deal with Iran itself contained far too many major concessions: it recognized Iran's right to enrichment, despite longstanding United States policy against such recognition, and settled for a weak inspections regime that is anything but "anytime, anywhere."

We must act again today to put a stop to the concessions. For that reason, I urge my colleagues to pass this urgent measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate on the bill has expired.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 PRINTED IN PART A OF HOUSE REPORT 114-818 OFFERED BY MR. HUIZENGA OF MICHIGAN

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 1, before line 1, insert the following:
SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "No U.S. Financing for Iran Act".

Page 1, line 7, strike "that is ordinarily incident to" and insert "in connection with".

Page 4, after line 3, insert the following:

TITLE III—SUNSET

SEC. 301. SUNSET.

This Act and the amendment made by this Act shall cease to be effective on the date that is 30 days after the date on which the President certifies to Congress that the Government of Iran has ceased providing support for acts of international terrorism.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 921, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, at this point my amendment adds a short title and clarifies the nature of prohibited Iranian transactions. The amendment also provides for a sunset of the bill's provision upon presidential certification that Iran has ceased support of international terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this amendment and the underlying bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HECK of Washington. The key change made by this amendment is to strike the phrase "ordinarily incident to" and insert "in connection with." One is a term of art commonly used by the Treasury's Office of Foreign Assets Control, or OFAC. Companies doing business with an OFAC license know what that means.

In connection with is a much broader term, not clearly defined, Mr. Speaker, and if this amendment were to pass, exactly how attenuated of a connection would be impermissible?

Crickets, because we don't know.

I believe the chilling effect of this language would go far beyond the purported intent of this legislation. And let there be no confusion what the intent is, which is to block a single legal, fully compliant, and scandal-free business transaction that supports both our national security and American manufacturing.

If this bill became law, we would be less safe. The U.S. specifically com-

mitted in the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, or the Iran Deal, as we refer to it, to allow the sale of commercial aircraft to Iran, as well as the provision of associated services. Associated services is specifically defined in the relevant section of the agreement to include financial services of the kind U.S. banks would be specifically blocked from providing under this bill.

Well, it is hard to think of anything that would be a clearer violation of our own commitments under the JCPOA, an action that would give Iran a meaningful reason to walk away from the whole thing, making us less safe. It is a clear, black-and-white violation of the JCPOA.

And what is our plan B if Congress provokes the collapse of this agreement? Crickets. We don't have one.

Think of how much went into the successful negotiation of the agreement. We had to convince a lot of countries, with whom we don't often always agree, to maintain a united front for U.N. sanctions to be effective.

If we choose to burn down the JCPOA, which this will do, entirely of our own volition, are my colleagues under any illusion that we could simply go back to our partners, not to mention Iran, and say with a straight face: Well, let's start over.

And why wouldn't Iran just happily revel in the unraveling of the mighty international coalition which brought them to the table and go back to building up its nuclear program again?

Again, crickets, because they would be likely to.

So let's be clear. Yes, we continue to have numerous and serious differences with Iran. But as we counter their destabilizing behavior in other parts of the Middle East, I know I sleep better at night knowing that the Iran deal prevents them from obtaining a nuclear bomb with which to set off either a regional arms race or threaten our allies with nuclear blackmail.

And frankly, if Iran is going to get new planes—and nothing in this bill will stop them, the choice is really not whether it is going to be Boeing or Airbus—I sleep better at night knowing that you have got American eyes on that plane in the form of the after-sale services for parts repair and American hands doing the maintenance to guard against the diversion from legitimate civil aviation use. It keeps us more safe if these are American-made planes.

But even if we ignore all the compelling evidence that this bill will make us less safe, this bill fails spectacularly at preventing Iran from buying airplanes. In fact, I am certain it would hurt our own aerospace industry way more than it would hurt Iran.

It is easy for foreign companies to get around this bill. They easily go to non-U.S. banks for financing. But American companies don't have that option to cut out U.S. banks entirely, unless you prefer that the proceeds from a sale be kept offshore, that American workers and communities

never see a dime of reinvestment, and the more than 100,000 jobs this transaction could support go to other countries.

This bill is also an attack on a key pillar of support for our exporters, including the aerospace exporters, namely, the Ex-Im Bank. Despite the fact that the Ex-Im Bank already has a policy against this, despite the fact that there is law against this, despite the fact that the Ex-Im has said they won't do this, and despite the fact that the seller, Boeing, has said in writing they won't do this.

This isn't belts and suspenders. This is stapling your pants to your flesh.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this bill that undermines foundational elements of our national and economic security, and, in so doing, I too am reminded of what President Reagan once said: "It's not what you don't know that bothers me, it's what you think you know that ain't so."

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Washington, who has been a big proponent of the Export-Import Bank and a particular company that he was alluding to and talking about, knows, though, that this bill would apply to any aircraft that the Treasury authorizes for Iran. That includes the 17 Airbus planes for Iran Air. And he brought up, actually, offshore profits.

Well, according to Bloomberg, Boeing has \$800 million—\$800 million in profits stashed offshore; and the reports are that Boeing is pursuing these deals with the Japanese bank already, not a U.S. bank. And apparently the company is less worried about this bill and that financing than my friend from Washington is.

□ 1900

So this is simply about saying that Iran does not have direct access to the U.S. financial system. I don't understand why my friends and colleagues on the other side of the aisle are so freaked out by that. This is simply about making sure that our banking system is not going to finance this deal indirectly or directly and that the use of the Export-Import Bank would be prohibited.

This amendment says it is a sunset to this bill upon Presidential certification that Iran has ceased support of international terrorism—a goal we all have. So if the President can support that and certify that, then this falls away. So we do not say that this deal is not allowed. We simply say that U.S. financial institutions cannot be used for this and that we cannot and will not use the Export-Import Bank—a U.S. taxpayer-funded entity—to do this.

At the end of the day, in April of this past year, Secretary Jack Lew told us that there will be no access; and either he misled the United States citizens

and this body at that time or they changed their mind. They haven't told us which, but neither one is acceptable.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended, and on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA).

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SWALWELL of California. I am opposed in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Swalwell of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5711 to the Committee on Financial Services with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 2, after line 2, insert the following new section:

SEC. 103. PROTECTING U.S. ELECTIONS.

The Secretary of the Treasury may not authorize a transaction described under section 101 by a U.S. financial institution if such institution is engaged in business with a foreign entity that has been found by the Secretary, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, to have engaged in or authorized cyber attacks targeting any election held in the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, this final amendment says plainly that no U.S. business may do business with a country that has used cyber attacks to undermine a U.S. election.

So if my colleagues are genuine in believing that Iran is a hopeless adversary, then surely they will join me in believing that Russia, in its efforts to undermine our recent November election, should also be treated as such.

This motion is really about the future of two U.S. adversaries: Iran and Russia. Iran, surely a bad actor over the last few decades, has finally in the last couple of years come to the international table and struck an agreement with the United States and many of our allies to make sure that we take it from being a country that is 3

months away from having a nuclear weapon to 1 year away. They continue to sponsor terrorism across the world. But today, better than ever before, we have eyes, ears, and checks and balances on them that we have never had. By the way, we can address all of their bad behavior with them being much farther away from having a nuclear weapon than they were before the Iran nuclear agreement.

Russia, however, continues to wreak chaos in the Middle East supporting Syria and its brutal dictator Assad. Russia brought down a commercial airliner over Ukraine and has further incurred into Ukraine taking over Crimea. Russia continues to attack and escalate hostilities with U.S. personnel at our embassy in Moscow.

Now the standard bearer for the Republican Party, President-elect Trump, has chosen to embrace Russia and take the United States on a new tack.

So the question today is: If you believe Iran is hopeless, then do you believe that we should also make sure no U.S. business does business with a country that is trying to undermine our elections?

I want to go through some of that evidence. On October 7 of this year, Director of National Intelligence Clapper said that the intelligence community is confident that the Russian Government directed cyber attacks aimed at disrupting our November elections.

Why would Russia do this?

Russia clearly had a favored candidate in this race in President-elect Trump. Russia has been successful.

This amendment says that you cannot do business with any country that is trying to influence our elections. This amendment says that if you think Iran is a bad actor, then you have to treat Iran the same way you treat Russia. This amendment says that if you think the U.S. should allow businesses to do business with a country trying to undermine our elections, to undermine the will of our constituents, then you should vote against this amendment.

If you are with Russia, then you should be against this motion. However, if you believe that we are closer to preventing Iran from having a nuclear weapon than we were a year ago, and if you believe that it is better for a U.S. manufacturer to provide commercial airliners to Iran and create U.S. jobs and have eyes and ears on what is going on over there, then you should be for this motion. But if you want our elections to be free and fair from outside influence, then vote for this motion. If you want to stand with Russia, then you should vote against this motion.

So I ask my colleagues on the other side: Are you going to embrace the new U.S. foreign policy that your standard bearer has proposed, that we are going to undermine and unravel the agreement that we have struck with Iran and march millions of young men and women back into the Middle East, an area where we have not had major combat operations finally for the first time

in 15 years? Or do you think that we should treat Iran the same way that we are treating Russia?

So I submit that to my colleagues, and I invite them to maybe engage on that question because that is what this motion is about: Do you stand with Russia? Or do you stand with preventing U.S. businesses from doing business with a country that our intelligence community has said has tried to undermine our elections?

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan. Well, America, you just heard a ridiculous straw-man choice laid out in front of you.

Mr. Speaker, this is not about anything other than selling and financing aircraft sales to Iran. That is what this bill is about. This is what this bill should be about.

I will point out to my colleague that there are some pretty major kinetic activities—I believe they are called at this point, which means shooting war—happening in Mosul and other places where our troops are involved.

But at the end of the day, Mr. Speaker, I want to encourage my colleagues to vote “no” on this motion to recommit. I look forward to working with colleagues on both sides of the aisle to address concerns that we may have with other foreign governments in the future, and I would request that they vote for the underlying bill, H.R. 5711.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RESIGNATION FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation from the House of Representatives:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, November 16, 2016.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER, this letter is to inform you that I have sent a letter to California

Governor Jerry Brown informing him that I am resigning my position as the United States Representative for the 44th Congressional District of California effective Sunday, December 4, 2016.

In November, I was elected by the people of Los Angeles County to serve as County Supervisor for District 4. It has been a privilege to serve the residents of California in the House of Representatives for the last five and a half years. I have worked to build a better future for our state and country.

I also want to thank you Mr. Speaker and my colleagues in the House. I have enjoyed working with you and my colleagues during my time in Congress. I look forward to continuing our work together in order to build a better country.

Sincerely,

JANICE HAHN,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, November 16, 2016.

Hon. EDMUND G. BROWN,
Governor of California,
Sacramento, CA.

DEAR GOVERNOR BROWN, in November, I was elected by the residents of Los Angeles County to serve as Supervisor for District 4. I am hereby resigning my position as the United States Representative for the 44th District of California effective Sunday, December 4, 2016.

It has been a privilege to serve the residents of California in the House of Representatives for the last five and a half years. I have worked to build a better future for our state and country.

I also want to thank you and your administration as well as my colleagues in California's Congressional delegation. I have enjoyed working with you and them during my time in Congress. I look forward to continuing this important work for the residents of Los Angeles County.

Sincerely,

JANICE HAHN,
Member of Congress.

TRADE'S IMPACT ON AMERICAN WORKERS

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, we in the industrial Midwest and Great Lakes heartland know firsthand why the Presidential election was so hard fought and close in Ohio, Pennsylvania, Michigan, and Wisconsin.

Our reasoning has endured a grim reality with a decades-long economic struggle to produce good jobs with good wages and benefits, but what we have experienced is a continuous outsourcing of millions of jobs to penny-wage sweatshops in Mexico, China, Bangladesh, and beyond. To the people of America's heartland, it feels like jobs are being moved just about everywhere but into the Midwest and Great Lakes.

Daily we witness trainloads of imports flooding into our Nation, as closed and protected markets abroad block mutual exchange of exports. America hasn't had balanced trade accounts for three decades, and workers in those nations struggle to survive on measly wages and without spare cash

cannot buy much of what they produce anyway.

Meanwhile, pink-slipped U.S. workers have endured a painful toll—annual wages now \$7,000 less per year on average in northern Ohio—while the cost of education expenses, health care, and everyday life rise and further squeeze pocketbooks.

Please don't tell us robots took the jobs.

This daily reality was the major backdrop to this recent election and deserves closer attention in the coming days. America's trade policy must result in trade balances, new jobs here, and preferably trade surpluses for our country, not job loss. That policy must be fashioned on the fundamental value of free and fair trade among free people.

“NONE OF THE ABOVE”—THE CURE FOR WHAT AILS US

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, we have gone through a terrible and traumatic experience in the last year called a U.S. Presidential election. I don't know how many countless people were utterly mortified by this whether or not their chosen candidate won. As it happened, the candidate whom I voted for lost last Tuesday, but I would be foolish if I ignored the fact that people all across America had a miserable, terrible experience with this Presidential election whether or not their candidate won or lost.

You ask yourself: How could that be? Why don't we cherish the opportunity to choose our national leader? How is it that we have been sucked into this negative vortex of hatred and vilification called choosing a President of the United States?

It seems utterly imponderable.

I was watching Saturday Night Live just a couple days before the election, and the not-Hillary actor and the not-Donald actor could agree on only one thing. This is what they said: “This whole election has been mean. Don't you guys feel gross all the time about this?”

They were speaking to us, not to each other. They were speaking to us, the American people. They are right. It is gross. But the question for us is very simple: Does it really have to be that way? Or could we somehow transform this into what it is supposed to be, an exhilarating jubilee revolving around choosing a leader who will make America a better place?

□ 1915

But you have to understand that we are in a deep, deep hole here. Both major Presidential candidates entered this campaign with deeply negative favorability ratings, so negative they